

REPORT

2015 Massachusetts Nursing Faculty Workload Survey *Summary Report*

September 2015

**Prepared by
The University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute for the
Massachusetts Action Coalition**

The Massachusetts Action Coalition (MAAC) is a partnership of:

**American Nurses Association, MA
Homecare Alliance of MA
MA Association of Colleges of Nursing
MA Board of Registration in Nursing
MA & RI League for Nursing
MA Coalition of Nurse Practitioners
MA Hospital Association
MA Nurses Association
MA Senior Care Foundation
Organization of Nurse Leaders, CT, MA, NH, RI (Co-lead Organization)
Practical Nurse Council
MA Public 2-Year Colleges
MA Public State Universities
The University of Massachusetts System
MA Private 2-Year Colleges
MA Private 4-Year Colleges
MA Department of Higher Education (Co-lead Organization)**

Acknowledgements

The survey upon which this report is based was developed by the Massachusetts Action Coalition (MAAC) Faculty Team who also informed and guided the report itself. Their time and insight are greatly valued.

MAAC Faculty Team Co-leaders:

Nancy Phoenix Bittner

PhD, CNS, RN; Vice President for Education, Professor, Nursing, Lawrence Memorial/Regis College Nursing and Radiography Programs

Karen Manning

RN, MSN; Nursing Division Chair, Laboure College

MAAC Faculty Team Members:

Cynthia Francis Bechtel

PhD, RN, CEN, CNE, CHSE; Associate Professor/Coordinator MSN Program, Framingham State University

Linda Frontiero

DNP, RN; Director of the Nursing Resource Center Professor RN-BSN Nursing Program, Salem State University

Nancy Kowal

MS, ANP, BC, CRNA (retired); Adjunct Professor, UMass Medical School Graduate School of Nursing; Consultant

Carol A. Silveira

MS, RN; Assistant Director, MA Board of Registration in Nursing, Division of Health Professions Licensure, Department of Public Health

The MAAC Faculty Team would like to extend its own thanks to Jean Supel, Research Manager with the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute for her work analyzing the survey data and writing this report.

Executive Summary

According to the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, “Faculty shortages at nursing schools across the country are limiting student capacity at a time when the need for professional registered nurses continues to grow.”¹ This trend affects the nursing workforce both nationally, as well as here in Massachusetts. In seeking to better understand the nursing faculty shortage in Massachusetts, the Nursing Faculty Subcommittee, associated with the Massachusetts Academic Progression in Nursing (APIN) grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, worked with the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute to design and administer a survey of the Commonwealth’s incumbent faculty nurse population. The Nursing Faculty Workload (NFW) survey was implemented online in May and June 2015 and was intended to gather information on the characteristics of nursing faculty across the state (at both public and private institutions for all certificate/degree levels) and their workloads. Highlights of the survey findings include:

- Respondents were primarily over the age of 50 and not very diverse, both in terms of gender and race/ethnicity. This lack of diversity is a concern, given a trend we see in the demographics of the general community: nursing faculty are becoming increasingly unlike the communities for which they are preparing nurses.
- The majority of respondents were full-time educators and held some form of professorship. However, one in five full-time respondents achieved that status through multiple positions. This potentially indicates a demand for full-time positions within the nursing workforce that is not being met by institutions.
- The percentage of jobs that were joint appointments was lower than expected (13% of respondents) and it was unclear whether 35% of those were actual joint appointments or simply multiple separate jobs.
- The majority (54%) of respondents had only been teaching for 10 years or less. This group had an average age of 47, indicating that a number of respondents began teaching at a later age.
- The percentage of time spent in administrative responsibilities, classroom teaching, and student advisement was fairly equal across teaching levels (e.g., practical versus associate versus bachelor’s). However, part-time respondents spent most of their time teaching clinical studies (56% of their time) while full-time respondents spent the largest amount of their time teaching classroom studies (37% of their time).
- No standard calculation of workload exists across the institutions that employed survey respondents. Contracts vary from 9 to 12 months. Workload is measured through credits or courses, per semester or per year, and through a variety of other mechanisms.
- Respondents were most satisfied with the mission of their college (94%) and least satisfied with the support given by the college for faculty research (54%). Part-time respondents were slightly more satisfied in general than full-time respondents and respondents under the age of 45 were more satisfied in general than those 45–55 or over 55. Satisfaction with specific job aspects varied widely according to employment status (full- or part-time), minority status, and age.

¹ American Association of Colleges of Nursing. (2015). Nursing Faculty Shortage Fact Sheet. Retrieved from <http://www.aacn.nche.edu/media-relations/FacultyShortageFS.pdf>

- The potential reasons for leaving an institution varied widely by age. Seventy-eight percent (78%) of respondents over 55 reported that retirement was a reason for which they are likely to leave their institution. Fifty-three percent (53%) of respondents under 45 reported that more career advancement opportunities were a reason for which they are likely to leave their institution. This potentially indicates that retention of faculty in different age groups might require different incentives.

Discussion/Implications

Fifty-one percent (51%) of survey respondents reported that their workload had increased as a result of the faculty shortage. Given that 32% of respondents were 60 or older, and will likely be retiring within the next 10 years, it is probable that this workload will continue to increase unless an infusion of new faculty can be made. When the potential for even greater workloads is combined with the approximate age level of those entering the profession, as well as the fact that 32% of respondents between the ages of 45 and 55 indicated that one of the reasons they were likely to leave their institution had to do with flexibility to balance work/life issues, it is likely that filling faculty positions will only become more difficult.

In addition, the current distribution of faculty may not be in alignment with policies focused on increasing the number of nurses who hold bachelor's degrees. Fifty-five percent (55%) of respondents to the survey reported teaching exclusively at the practical nursing or associate level, and a number of those hold credentials that are not transferrable to teaching at the bachelor's level or higher.

The degree to which the nursing faculty population is not in alignment with the communities for which they are preparing nurses is a concern, especially given that minority respondents were much less satisfied with the climate for racial and ethnic minority faculty members than non-minority respondents (60% versus 92% respectively). This suggests that while many faculty think their institution is culturally aware and sensitive, it may not be so in actuality. As a consequence, programs may face unanticipated challenges in properly preparing nurses to work in diverse communities or to welcome diverse professionals to their ranks.

An area that would be important for future study is how and why individuals transferred into nursing faculty later in life (e.g., after age 40). As mentioned earlier, the NFW survey data indicate that a number of nursing faculty entered the profession later. What was it that attracted this group to the profession? What drew them away from their other careers? How can more individuals be recruited? How can individuals with diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds, within underrepresented communities, be more effectively recruited? It is important that colleges of nursing look to outside sources (e.g., non-faculty nursing careers and positions) in order to increase the number of faculty. Otherwise, everyone is simply competing over the same limited pool and not truly expanding the number of individuals in the profession.

Background

The following background information was written by the head of the Faculty Opportunities Project Team:

Nursing schools nationwide report a shortage of faculty and an inability to hire additional faculty². Among the reasons reported are: (a) insufficient funds to hire new faculty, (b) unwillingness of administration to commit to additional full-time positions, (c) inability to recruit qualified faculty because of competition for jobs with other marketplaces, and (d) applicants who are qualified for faculty positions but are unavailable in the geographic area. There is a demonstrated need to sustain and stabilize faculty currently in the workforce to avoid exacerbating the current and future faculty shortage in nursing. Current major recommendations address recruitment, retention, and development of faculty.

The Massachusetts Action Coalition established the Faculty Project Team in 2012 as part of the Academic Progression in Nursing (APIN) grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The Faculty Team was comprised of administrative and faculty representatives from nursing programs at state community colleges, state universities, the University of Massachusetts campuses, and private institutions of higher education, along with service representatives located in Massachusetts. The overall mission of the work is to address the need for sustainable, competent faculty to educate professional nurses. The goal for this initiative is to increase the faculty pool available to educate nurses from BSN through doctoral degrees. The strategies identified address challenges from both the recruitment and retention angles, as well as the retirement perspective. Multiple strategies were utilized to focus on addressing the issues of delay of retirement or return of retired faculty to teaching.

During the primary work on the faculty challenges and the shortage, it became evident that there was no consistently accepted definition of a nursing faculty workload. Data from interviews and prior research revealed that full-time faculty satisfaction was directly related to the operationalization of their role. Few faculty described their role as solely teaching with small amounts of service and scholarship. Rather, many reported multiple roles within the full-time faculty position, some of which were identified as administrative activities that contributed to job dissatisfaction.

The purpose of this survey was to gather data to identify roles and responsibilities of faculty teaching at all levels for further analysis and development of subsequent recommendations. The survey of Faculty Roles & Responsibilities (Faculty Workload) was completed in June 2015. Information from this survey will be used to identify and describe the Nursing Faculty Workload, identify impact of retirement and other retention issues, and identify recommendations that support the need to sustain and stabilize faculty currently in the workforce to avoid exacerbating the current and future faculty shortage in nursing.

² American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN). (2014c). *Survey on Vacant Faculty Positions for Academic Year 2014-2015*.

Results

A survey of incumbent nursing faculty was conducted during the spring of 2015. The questionnaire was designed by the Faculty Project Team associated with the MA Academic Progression in Nursing (APIN) grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The survey was administered by the University of Massachusetts Donahue Institute via the Qualtrics online platform in May and June 2015. Unfortunately, no comprehensive directory of nursing faculty exists for the state of Massachusetts. Developing such a list was discussed, but it was determined by the Faculty Opportunities Project Team that having that level of contact would, in fact, be a deterrent to participation (i.e., it would be seen as too much personal information associated with the survey responses). Instead, the head (Executive Director, Dean, etc.) of every nursing department from both public and private institutions was sent an email asking them to forward the survey link to their faculty. Furthermore, respondents were not asked to name their employer institution on the survey. These steps were to ensure the absolute anonymity of respondents. As a result, however, the number of faculty invited to participate in the survey, and the percentage who responded, is unknown.

A total of 182 individuals responded to at least one question on the survey. No question required an answer. As a result, the number of respondents varies by individual question. Percentages, consequently, are calculated against the number of respondents to a particular question. Where two or more questions are analyzed together, the number of respondents will always be the number who answered all of the questions involved (and, hence, may be fewer than the individual questions).

The following summary report presents results of the survey grouped by question focus. This will be followed by a conclusion that summarizes the major points.

Demographics

Table 1 shows respondents' reported ages. **In general, the respondent population is weighted heavily toward the 50-and-over age range, with two-thirds of question respondents giving ages in this range.** Only 21 (or 13%) of the question respondents were under 40, compared to 32% who were 60 or older. These data indicate that the aging of the nursing faculty workforce is a concern.

Table 1: Respondents' Ages							
By 5-Year Increments			By 10-Year Increments			By Under/Over 50	
Range	Percentage		Range	Percentage		Range	Percentage
Under 30	4%		Under 40	13%		Under 50	33%
30-34	3%						
35-39	6%						
40-44	6%						
45-49	14%		40-49	20%		50 or Over	67%
50-54	15%		50-59	35%			
55-59	21%		60-69	25%			
60-64	22%						
65-69	4%		70+	6%			
70+	6%						
# Question Respondents = 158							

Table 2 shows respondents' reported gender. **The respondent population is predominantly female, with 96% of respondents reporting this as their gender.** Female respondents ranged in age from 26 to 78 with an average age of 54. Male respondents, on the other hand, ranged in age from 38 to 61 with an average age of 50, indicating that middle-age respondents are more diverse in terms of gender than younger or older respondents.

Table 2: Respondents' Gender	
Gender	Percentage
Female	96%
Male	4%
# Question Respondents = 179	

Tables 3A to 3C show various racial/ethnic distributions of respondents. **The respondent population is predominantly non-Hispanic (98%) and White (95%) according to respondents' answers.** There was no pattern in terms of race/ethnicity across age ranges. This racial/ethnic makeup is vastly different from the communities in which a number of nursing programs are based.

Table 3A: Is Respondent Hispanic or Latino?	
Hispanic or Latino	Percentage
No	98%
Yes	2%
# Question Respondents = 174	

Table 3B: Respondents' Race*	
Race	Percentage
White	95%
Black	3%
Asian	1%
Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	1%
Other	1%
American Indian / Alaska Native	1%
# Question Respondents = 169	

*Responses add up to over 100% as this was a "choose all that apply" question.

Table 3C: Respondents' Ethnicity*	
Ethnicity	Percentage
American	70%
European**	34%
French Canadian	6%
Portuguese	4%
Other	4%
Middle Eastern	2%
African American	2%
African	1%
# Question Respondents = 161	

*Responses add up to over 100% as this was a "choose all that apply" question.

**Includes specific groups reported such as "Irish" or "Italian."

Summary: The demographic information associated with respondents confirmed the general impressions of nursing faculty demographics already held by professionals in the field. Current nursing faculty are not very diverse, with respondents to the survey being primarily over the age of 50 (67%), female (96%), non-Hispanic (98%) and White (95%). Furthermore, 32% of respondents (almost one in three) were age 60 or older. The thought that younger cohorts might be more diverse than older cohorts did not hold true with regard to this study's data: in terms of gender diversity, it was the middle-age cohort that showed the highest percentage of males, and there was no pattern detected across age related to race/ethnicity. This lack of diversity is a concern, given the trends we see in the demographics of the general community: nursing faculty are becoming increasingly unlike the communities for which they are preparing nurses.

Current Appointment

Table 4 shows the number of paid jobs in academic positions that were held by respondents during the 2014–2015 academic year. **The majority (77%) of respondents held a single position.** Twenty-four percent (24%), however, held two or more positions. Of those who held one position, 80% were full-time and 20% were part-time. Of those who held two or more positions, 64% were full-time and 36% were part-time. This percentage of faculty holding multiple positions to achieve full-time status is potentially indicative of a demand among them for full-time positions that is not being met by institutions.

Table 4: Respondents' Number of Paid Jobs in Academic Roles During the 2014-2015 Academic Year

Number of Paid Jobs	Percentage
1	77%
2	17%
3	6%
4	1%
# Question Respondents = 181	

Tables 5A and 5B indicate how many, and what kind, of joint appointments were held by respondents. **The vast majority (87%) do not hold joint appointments.** Of the 23 people who reported holding joint appointments, 7 (30%) held faculty and advanced practice appointments, 6 (26%) gave no description of the appointment, and 5 (22%) reported holding staff RN, adjunct or per diem positions. Fifteen (or 11%) respondents who held one paid job (see Table 4 above) reported they held a joint appointment. Seen from another direction, 15 (or 65%) joint appointments were held by someone who worked only at a single job. This is important to note because it is unclear whether the remaining eight (or 35%) joint appointments are truly “joint appointments” (defined as having two roles through a single employer) or simply people who have multiple jobs.

Table 5A: Respondents' Joint Appointment Status

Respondent Holds a Joint Appointment	Percentage
No	87%
Yes	13%
# Question Respondents = 181	

Table 5B: Nature of Joint Appointment (% of “Yes” from Table 5A)

Nature of Joint Appointment	Percentage
Faculty & Advanced Practice	30%
No Specification	26%
Staff RN, Adjunct & Per Diem	22%
Faculty & Administration	9%
PACU / School Health	4%
PN Coordinator	4%
Professional Development	4%
N = 23	

Table 6 shows the current academic rank or title of respondents. **Thirty-one percent (31%) reported being Assistant Professors while another 31% reported being Instructors.** Eighteen percent (18%) reported being “Professors” and 14% reported being Associate Professors. Only two (or 1%) reported being adjunct faculty. These data indicate that a majority of respondents (63%) held some form of professorship.

Table 6: Respondents’ Current Academic Rank or Title

Rank/Title	Percentage
Assistant Professor	31%
Instructor	31%
Professor	18%
Associate Professor	14%
Other	4%
Adjunct	1%
# Question Respondents = 181	

Table 7A shows respondents’ current employment status. **The majority of respondents (77%) worked full-time.** Only 23% of respondents worked part-time. Of respondents who worked full-time, 80% reported holding one paid academic role and 20% reported holding two or more paid academic roles. One in five full-time respondents achieved that status through multiple positions. This circumstance potentially indicates a demand for full-time positions that is not being met. Of respondents who worked part-time, 64% reported holding one paid academic role and 36% reported holding two or more academic roles. Similar to the pattern with full-time status, this percentage of respondents holding multiple academic roles may be indicative of a demand for positions with more hours than are currently offered.

Table 7B shows respondents’ tenure status by employment status. **Of the individuals who responded to both questions (the one about employment status and the one about tenure status), 49% of the full-time respondents were not on a tenure track compared to 90% of part-time respondents.** Nineteen percent (19%) of full-time respondents were on the tenure track (but not tenured yet) while another 32% of respondents were fully tenured.

Table 7A: Respondents’ Employment Status

Employment Status	Percentage
Full-time	77%
Part-time	23%
# Question Respondents = 180	

Table 7B: Respondents' Employment Status by Faculty Tenure Status

Employment Status	Tenure Status	Percentage
Full-time	Not on tenure track	49%
	On tenure track, not tenured yet	19%
	Tenured faculty member	32%
Part-time	Not on tenure track	90%
	On tenure track, not tenured yet	5%
	Tenured faculty member	5%
# Respondents (to both questions) = 178		

Tables 8A and 8B show respondents' distribution by tenure status (8A) as well as both tenure status and employment status (8B). **The majority of respondents (58%) were not on a tenure track.** Sixteen percent (16%) were on a tenure track (but not tenured yet) and 26% were fully tenured. Of the respondents who said they were not on a tenure track, 63% were employed full-time compared to 93% for respondents on a tenure track (but not tenured yet) and 96% for fully tenured respondents.

Table 8A: Respondents' Faculty Tenure Status

Tenure Status	Percentage
Not on tenure track	58%
On tenure track, not tenured yet	16%
Tenured faculty member	26%
# Question Respondents = 181	

Table 8B: Respondents' Faculty Tenure Status by Employment Status

Tenure Status	Employment Status	Percentage
Not on tenure track	Full-time	63%
	Part-time	36%
On tenure track, not tenured yet	Full-time	93%
	Part-time	7%
Tenured faculty member	Full-time	96%
	Part-time	4%
# Respondents (to both questions) = 178		

Summary: The majority of survey respondents held one paid academic position (77%) that was not a joint appointment (87%), were some form of professor (63%), were full-time (77%), and not on a tenure track (58%). Of the 23 respondents that reported holding a joint appointment, only 15 (or 65%) of them were employed in a single role. Meaning, there is a question about whether the other eight (or 35%) were actually "joint appointments" or simply people who help multiple paid academic positions. One in five full-time respondents achieved that status through multiple positions. This potentially indicates a demand for full-time positions that is not being met. Of respondents who worked part-time, 64% reported holding one paid academic role and 36% reported holding two or more academic roles. Whether full-time (49%) or part-time (90%), a large number of respondents were not on a tenure track. Respondents who were on a tenure track (but not tenured yet) or fully tenured were employed full-time at much higher rates than respondents who were not on a tenure track.

Teaching Experience

Table 9A shows the distribution of respondents across years of teaching. **The majority (54%) reported teaching 10 years or less.** Twenty-one percent (21%), however, reported teaching more than 20 years. The average age of someone who reported teaching 10 years or less was 47, indicating that a number of respondents likely begin teaching at a later age.

Table 9B shows respondents' years of teaching by undergraduate or graduate level. **Among those who taught undergraduate classes, 58% had done so for 10 or fewer years. Among those who taught graduate classes, 79% had done so for 10 or fewer years.** One hundred ten (110) survey respondents reported teaching only at the undergraduate level, compared to five (5) who reported teaching only at the graduate level. Forty-seven (47) survey respondents reported teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Among those who reported teaching both, it is not known whether this is due to teaching at both levels simultaneously or switching from teaching at one level to teaching at the other level at some point in a career.

Table 9A: Respondents' Number of Years Teaching Nursing--Total	
Years Teaching Nursing	Percentage
0-5	28%
6-10	26%
11-15	13%
16-20	13%
21-25	6%
26-30	5%
31+	10%
# Question Respondents = 176	

Table 9B: Respondents' Number of Years Teaching Undergraduate or Graduate Nursing			
Undergraduate		Graduate	
Years	Percentage	Years	Percentage
0-5	34%	0-5	59%
6-10	24%	6-10	20%
11-15	12%	11-15	4%
16-20	12%	16-20	10%
21-25	6%	21-25	4%
26-30	6%	26-30	0%
31+	6%	31+	4%
# Respondents = 156		# Respondents = 51	

Table 10 shows the number of years respondents have spent at their current primary institution. **The most frequent length of employment at a current primary institution was zero to five years (44%).** When crossed with total years of teaching overall, it emerges that the longer respondents have been teaching, the less likely they are to have been with their current institution the whole time; that is, the longer a respondent has been teaching, the more likely she is to have switched institutions at least once. Among the 173 respondents who answered both questions, only 20% of those who have been teaching over 20 years had done so at one institution, compared to 50% among those who reported teaching between 11 and 20 years.

Table 10: Respondents' Number of Years at Present Primary Institution

Years at Primary Institution	Percentage
0-5	44%
6-10	23%
11-15	14%
16-20	9%
21-25	7%
26-30	2%
31+	2%
# Question Respondents = 177	

Summary: The majority (54%) of respondents had only been teaching for 10 years or less, and the average age of someone who reported teaching 10 years or less was 47, indicating that a number of respondents began teaching at a later age. Respondents teaching graduate-level classes were more likely to have taught 10 or fewer years at that level (59%) than those who reported teaching at the undergraduate level (34%), potentially indicating that there is a progression of teaching undergraduates early in a career and then teaching graduates later in a career. The majority (67%) of respondents reported being at their current primary institution for 10 or fewer years. When correlated with total years of teaching, it appears that the longer a respondent had been teaching, the more likely they were to have changed institutions at least once.

Nature of Teaching and Other Responsibilities

Table 11A shows the types of degrees offered by respondents' institutions. **Almost half (48%) of respondents' institutions offered associate degrees while another 45% offered bachelor's degrees.** Table 11B shows respondents' institutions categorized by their specific degrees offered. The most frequent specific type of institution for a respondent was one that only offered associate degrees (29%). The second-most-frequent specific type of institution for a respondent was one that offered bachelor's, master's, and doctorate degrees (18%). The number of less-than-four-year certificate and degree programs (52% of respondents reported their institution offered only practical nursing and/or associate degrees) may present a degree of misalignment between the current distribution of faculty across degree levels and policy that is pushing to increase the number/percentage of nurses with bachelor's degrees. This issue could be compounded by the fact that nursing faculty teaching at the below-bachelor's level generally have lower credentials than those who teach at the bachelor's level or higher. A number of those teaching at the below-bachelor's level possess only a bachelor's degree themselves and, consequently, are not able to easily transfer to teaching at higher degree levels.

Table 11A: Degrees in Nursing Offered by Respondents' Institutions - General*

Degree Type	Percentage
Practical Nursing	25%
Associate	48%
Bachelor's	45%
Master's	36%
Doctorate	23%
# Question Respondents = 181	

*Responses add up to over 100% as this was a "choose all that apply" question.

Table 11B: Degrees in Nursing Offered by Respondents' Institutions - Specific*

Degree Type	Percentage
Practical Nursing Only	15%
Practical Nursing & Associate	8%
Practical Nursing & Bachelor's	1%
Practical Nursing, Associate & Bachelor's	1%
Associate Only	29%
Associate, Bachelor's & Master's	1%
Associate, Bachelor's, Master's & Doctorate	2%
Bachelor's Only	4%
Bachelor's & Master's	11%
Bachelor's, Master's & Doctorate	18%
Master's Only	1%
Master's & Doctorate	3%
# Question Respondents = 181	

*Responses add up to 100% as institutions are only categorized once here.

Table 12A shows the number and percentage of respondents who spent at least some time teaching at each degree level. **The most frequently taught degree level was associate (43% of respondents) followed by bachelor's (34%).** Table 12B shows how respondents are distributed across teaching levels according to how they spend 100% of their time. Eighty-five percent (85%) of respondents who taught at the associate degree level and 79% of those who taught at the practical-nursing level did so exclusively, compared to only 47% of those at the bachelor's level and 9% of those at the doctorate level. These data reinforce the concerns presented in association with tables 11A and 11B regarding policies to increase the number/percentage of nurses with bachelor's degrees.

Table 12A: Respondents' Teaching Levels*

Degree Type	Percentage
Practical Nursing	24%
Associate	43%
Bachelor's	34%
Master's	19%
Doctorate	13%
# Question Respondents = 174	

*Responses add up to over 100% as this was a "choose all that apply" question.

Table 12B: Levels Where 100% of a Respondent's Time was in...*

Degree Type	Percentage
Practical Nursing	19%
Associate	36%
Bachelor's	16%
Master's	2%
Doctorate	1%
Combination: Undergraduate Only	7%
Combination: Graduate Only	3%
Combination: Both Undergraduate & Graduate	17%
# Question Respondents = 174	

*Responses add up to 100% as respondents are only categorized once here.

Table 13A shows the average number of hours per week worked by different types of respondents in various roles. Table 13B shows the percentage of total time per week within each respondent type spent on the roles. **On average, respondents spent a total of 37 hours across all of their roles.** This ranged from 25 hours for part-time respondents to 41 hours for full-time. Part-time respondents, on average, spent the most hours teaching clinical studies (56% of their time), compared to only 20% for full-time respondents. Full-time respondents spent the most time teaching classroom studies (37% of their time), compared to 17% for part-time respondents. The group that spent the most time teaching classroom studies were full-time, non-tenure-track respondents (39% of their time was in this role). The group that spent the most time teaching clinical studies were part-time respondents. Research and Service took up more time for respondents who were either tenured or on a tenure track than for other groups. Clinical practice took up much more time for part-time respondents than for any other group. These data suggest a difference in the nature of teaching responsibilities between full-time and part-time respondents.

Table 13C shows the average number of hours per week per role worked by full-time versus part-time respondents who reported spending at least some time in the role. The difference between Table 13A and 13C is that 13A takes into account respondents who reported spending zero hours in the activity (or, the average of all respondents to the question). 13C only counts those who reported spending time in each activity. When calculated in this manner, clear differences emerge between part-time and full-time respondents. **Full-time respondents who engaged in the roles spent much more time in administrative responsibilities, classroom teaching, and skills lab than part-time respondents. Part-time respondents who engaged in the roles spent more time in clinical teaching and clinical practice than full-time respondents.**

Table 13D shows the average percentage of time spent in different roles according to teaching level. Time was calculated here similarly to Table 13A: it counts respondents who reported spending zero amount of time in the activity. **In general, the percentage of time spent in administrative responsibilities, classroom teaching, and student advisement was fairly equal across teaching levels.** The two areas that varied significantly were clinical teaching (a much higher percentage at the bachelor's level or below) and research (a much higher percentage at the master's or doctorate levels).

Role	All Respondents: Part-time & Full-time	Part-time Respondents	Full-time Respondents	Full-time: not on tenure track	Full-time: on tenure track	Full-time tenured
Administrative Responsibilities	5	1	7	7	3	9
Teaching-Classroom	12	4	15	16	13	15
Teaching-Clinical	10	14	8	9	11	6
Research	2	0	2	1	2	3
Service	2	0	2	1	3	3
Clinical Practice	2	4	2	2	1	1
Student Advisement	2	1	3	3	3	3
Skills Lab Instruction	2	1	3	1	4	3
Total Hours	37	25	41	41	40	42

Table 13B: Respondents' Average Percentage of Time Per Week Spent on Different Roles by Employment and Tenure Status

Role	All Respondents: Part-time & Full-time	Part-time Respondents	Full-time Respondents	Full-time: not on tenure track	Full-time: on tenure track	Full-time tenured
Administrative Responsibilities	15%	3%	17%	18%	8%	21%
Teaching-Classroom	33%	17%	37%	39%	31%	36%
Teaching-Clinical	26%	56%	20%	22%	27%	15%
Research	4%	1%	5%	3%	5%	6%
Service	4%	0%	5%	3%	8%	6%
Clinical Practice	6%	16%	4%	6%	3%	1%
Student Advisement	7%	4%	7%	7%	8%	7%
Skills Lab Instruction	6%	3%	6%	4%	10%	8%

Table 13C: Respondents' Average Number of Hours Spent in Roles For Those Who Reported Spending at Least Some Time in that Role

Role	All	Full-time	Part-time
Administrative Responsibilities	10	11	3
Teaching-Classroom	15	16	9
Teaching-Clinical	15	14	17
Research	5	5	3
Service	4	4	4
Clinical Practice	14	11	22
Student Advisement	4	4	5
Skills Lab Instruction	9	10	5

Table 13D: Respondents' Percentage of Time Spent in Different Roles by Teaching Level

Role	Practical	Associate	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
Administrative Responsibilities	15%	17%	16%	15%	18%
Teaching-Classroom	42%	40%	43%	43%	40%
Teaching-Clinical	13%	15%	11%	6%	1%
Research	10%	7%	9%	14%	17%
Service	6%	6%	7%	7%	9%
Clinical Practice	8%	6%	7%	10%	11%
Student Advisement	7%	7%	7%	6%	4%
Skills Lab Instruction	0%	3%	1%	0%	0%

Table 14A shows the number of respondents who reported completing various activities during the previous academic year. **A majority of respondents reported creating or revising a course (71%), followed by 43% who reported giving presentations.** Table 14B shows what percentage of respondents completed how many of the activities. A majority of respondents (61%) reported completing at least one activity during the previous academic year. When correlated with type of teaching (undergraduate only versus undergraduate and graduate) the data show that 100% of respondents who reported teaching both undergraduate and graduate classes listed that

they had created or revised a course in the previous academic year, compared to only 61% of respondents who reported teaching only at the undergraduate level. Furthermore, 71% of respondents who reported teaching both undergraduate and graduate classes listed that they had done a presentation in the previous academic year, compared to only 32% of respondents who reported teaching only at the undergraduate level. These data may be indicative of the differences in amounts of research and service done by respondents at different teaching levels.

Table 14A: Activities Completed by Respondents Within the Previous Academic Year*

Activity	Percentage
Course created or revised	71%
Article published	18%
Presentations	43%
Grant proposal preparation	19%
# Question Respondents = 182	

*Responses add up to over 100% as this was a “choose all that apply” question.

Table 14B: Percentage of Respondents Who Completed at Least...*

# Activities	Role	Total
One activity	32%	61%
Two activities	7%	
Three activities	15%	
Four activities	7%	
# Question Respondents = 182		

*Responses add up to 100% as respondents are only categorized once here.

Summary: Fifty-eight percent (58%) of respondents reported they were at institutions that only offered undergraduate degrees (29% were at ones that only offered associate degrees), compared to 32% who were at institutions that offered both undergraduate and graduate degrees, and 4% whose institutions only offered graduate degrees. This was reflective of the types of classes taught by respondents: 36% reported only teaching at the associate-degree level and 19% at the practical-nursing level. In comparison, 16% of respondents only taught at the bachelor’s level. The average number of hours spent on work roles for part-time respondents was 25, compared to 41 for full-time respondents. Part-time respondents spent most of their time teaching clinical studies (56% of their time) while full-time respondents spent the largest amount of their time teaching classroom studies (37% of their time). The percentage of time spent in administrative responsibilities, classroom teaching, and student advisement was fairly equal across teaching levels (e.g., practical versus associate versus bachelor’s). A majority (61%) of respondents reported engaging in at least one academic activity during the previous academic year. However, respondents who taught classes at both the graduate and undergraduate levels reported engaging in these activities at higher rates than those who only taught undergraduate classes.

Workload

Table 15 shows the number and percentage of respondents who hold different-length contracts. **The most frequent length of contract held was nine months (43% of respondents).** The frequency of type of contract varied by whether respondents were full-time or part-time. Fifty-two percent (52%) of part-time respondents’ contracts were nine months, compared to 42% for full-time respondents. On the other hand, 30% of full-time respondents’ contracts were 10 months, compared to 19% for part-time respondents. The rate of 12-month contracts was almost equal for the two groups (29% for part-time and 28% for full-time).

Table 15: Respondents' Length of Teaching Contract

Length	Percentage
9 months	43%
10 months	29%
12 months	28%
# Question Respondents = 166	

Table 16 shows whether respondents' workload has changed as a result of the faculty shortage. **Fifty-one percent (51%) reported that their workload increased because of the faculty shortage.**

Table 16: How Has Respondents' Workload Been Impacted by the Faculty Shortage?

Type of Change	Percentage
Decreased	1%
Increased	51%
Remained about the same	47%
# Question Respondents = 177	

Table 17 shows how respondents' workloads are calculated at their primary institution. **The most frequent form of calculation was by number of credits per semester (29%).** This was followed by number of courses per semester (22%) and number of credits per academic year (20%). When correlated with whether a respondent was full-time or part-time there were some differences in the type of calculation. The most strongly different area was that 23% of full-time respondents had their workload calculated by number of credits per semester, compared to only 8% of part-time respondents. On the other hand, 33% of part-time respondents had their workload calculated by the number of courses per semester, compared to only 19% of full-time respondents. It should be noted that a wide variety of other explanations (17% of respondents) were reported as well. These other responses included answers such as a mix of the other options; course or credit time, but with no designation of by semester or by academic year; time spent in other roles; as well as a number of other answers.

Table 17: Respondents' Workload Calculation

Means of Calculation	Percentage
Number of courses per academic year	3%
Number of courses per semester	22%
Number of credits per academic year	20%
Number of credits per semester.	29%
Number of hours or hours per week	9%
Other	17%
# Question Respondents = 172	

Table 18A shows the number of courses taught per semester by respondents. Please note that fewer than 50% of the survey respondents answered this question. This is likely due to many respondents not calculating their workload in this manner. **Overall, among those who calculated their workload in courses per semester, the most frequent number of courses taught by respondents was only one (46%).** A total of 59% taught one to two courses per semester compared to 33% who taught three or more courses per semester. The distribution of full-time versus part-time respondents within this question does not match the overall distribution among all survey respondents (see Table 7A above). This is likely because the current measure (number of courses per semester alone) does not account for all of the roles and duties a respondent might have. Also, a higher percentage

of part-time respondents chose the number of courses per semester measure whereas a higher percentage of full-time respondents chose the number of credits per semester measure.

Table 18B shows the number of credits taught per semester by respondents. Please note that fewer than 50% of the survey respondents answered this question. This is likely due to many respondents not calculating their workload in this manner. **Overall, among those who calculated their workload in credits per semester, the most frequent number of credits taught by respondents was ten to twelve (49%).** A total of 76% taught from seven to twelve credits per semester compared to only 16% who taught six or fewer credits.

It should be noted that 37% of respondents who reported teaching only one course per semester also reported that they taught 8 to 13 credits per semester. This may be indicative of “courses” and “credits” measuring different things: that “credits” also cover areas like skills labs that are not seen as “courses,” or that certain instructional activities carry more credits than others.

Table 18A: Respondents' Workload – Number of Courses per Semester	
Number of Courses	Percentage
1	46%
2	13%
3	12%
4	20%
5	1%
Varies	7%
# Question Respondents = 84	

Table 18B: Respondents' Workload – Number of Credits per Semester	
Number of Credits	Percentage
1 – 3	4%
4 – 6	12%
7 – 9	27%
10 – 12	49%
13 – 15	4%
16 +	5%
# Question Respondents = 84	

Summary: The most frequent length of contract for respondents was nine months (43%). A majority (51%) of respondents reported that their workload had increased because of the current faculty shortage. Workload was calculated in a variety of different ways, with at least 20% of respondents reporting that their workload was calculated through the number of credits per academic year, the number of courses per semester, and the number of credits per semester. Another 17% reported that their workload was calculated through a formula different from the options given for the question. Respondents who reported what their workload was in terms of courses per semester painted a very different picture of workload from those who responded to what their workload was in terms of credits per semester. This may be indicative of “courses” and “credits” measuring different things: that “credits” also cover areas like skills labs that are not seen as “courses,” or that certain instructional activities carry more credits than others.

Job Satisfaction

Table 19A shows the percentage of respondents by full-time and part-time status who reported they were somewhat or very satisfied with different aspects of their job at their primary institution. **In general, part-time respondents were slightly more satisfied than full-time respondents.** However, satisfaction varied according to specific aspects and their categories. Full-time respondents were slightly more satisfied on average with compensation-related aspects of their jobs (e.g., benefits, salary, recognition, and tenure prospects) than part-time respondents. Within this category, though, full-time respondents were much more satisfied with their medical/health insurance benefits (71% versus 29% for part-time respondents) whereas part-time respondents were much more satisfied with the salary for their position (76% versus 52% for full-time respondents).

Rnnrrrr

Part-time respondents were slightly more satisfied with opportunities associated with their position than full-time respondents. Within this category, however, full-time respondents were much more satisfied with the opportunity for advancement (71% versus 60% for part-time respondents) while part-time respondents were much more satisfied with the autonomy and independence (100% versus 80% for full-time respondents).

Part-time respondents were also more satisfied with general aspects of their work environment than full-time respondents. Within this category, 93% of part-time respondents were satisfied with workload aspects of their position compared to 62% of full-time respondents. In addition, 95% of part-time respondents were satisfied with flexibility to balance work and family life, compared to 71% for full-time respondents. Full-time respondents, on the other hand, were much more satisfied with interactions with students in the classroom setting (93% versus 78% for part-time respondents).

Across all categories, the top four areas of satisfaction for full-time respondents were interactions with students in the classroom setting (93%), mission of the college (93%), meaningfulness of their work (91%), and relationships with peers (90%). The top four areas of satisfaction for part-time respondents were autonomy and independence (100%), opportunity to work independently (98%), mission of the college (98%), and variety of work (98%).

Across all categories, the four lowest areas of satisfaction for full-time respondents were support given by the college for faculty research (39%), salary for their position (52%), salary/compensation (54%), and support given by the college for community service (58%). The five lowest areas of satisfaction for part-time respondents were medical/health insurance benefits available (29%), support given by the college for faculty research (56%), opportunity for advancement (60%), benefits (65%), and support given by the college for community service (65%).

A respondent's age has an effect on their satisfaction with different job aspects. Table 19B shows respondents' satisfaction with job aspects by three age categories: under 45, 45–55, and over 55. **In general, respondents under 45 were the most satisfied across all job aspects (83%), respondents 45–55 were the least satisfied (71%), and respondents over 55 were in the middle (78%).** Respondents under 45 were least satisfied with medical/health insurance benefits (60%) and most satisfied with meaningfulness of their work, mission of the college, relationship with the school's administration, and sense of accomplishment from work (all 97%). Respondents 45–55 and over 55 were both least satisfied with support given by the college for faculty research (39% and 32% respectively). Respondents 45–55 were most satisfied with their relationships with peers (95%). Respondents over 55 were most satisfied with meaningfulness of their work, their relationships with peers, variety of work, and relationships with colleagues (all 93%). It is worth investigating what kind of life cycle issues are coming into play for each group to see how these affect satisfaction. This may be indicative of a need for different incentives for different ages with regard to retaining current, or recruiting new, faculty.

It is important to note, with relation to the climate for racial and ethnic minority faculty members, that the satisfaction rate for minority respondents was only 60% compared to 92% for non-minority respondents. This is reflective of differences in the positionality of respondents.

Table 19A: Respondents' Satisfaction with Aspects of Their Job at Their Primary Institution by Employment Status

Job Aspect	Full-time % Very or Somewhat Satisfied	Part-time % Very or Somewhat Satisfied
Benefits/Recognition/Salary/Tenure		
Benefits	83%	65%
Medical/health insurance benefits available	71%	29%
Recognition of your performance	67%	73%
Salary / compensation	54%	71%
Salary for my position	52%	76%
Job security / tenure prospects	86%	81%
Opportunities		
Autonomy and independence	80%	100%
Opportunities for career advancement	71%	75%
Opportunities to use your skills and abilities	78%	88%
Opportunity for advancement	71%	60%
Opportunity to try new, innovative ideas	88%	83%
Opportunity to use my abilities in my position	88%	90%
Opportunity to work independently	88%	98%
General Work Environment		
An atmosphere of academic freedom	80%	83%
Climate for racial and ethnic minority faculty members	88%	88%
College support for the professional growth of the faculty	72%	71%
Feeling safe in the work environment	83%	95%
Flexibility to balance work and family life	71%	95%
General environmental working conditions	72%	93%
Interactions with students in the classroom setting	93%	78%
Involvement of faculty in College decisions	69%	67%
Meaningfulness of your work	91%	95%
Mission of the College	93%	98%
Quality of your relationship with your school's administration	78%	93%
Relationships with peers	90%	90%
Sense of accomplishment I receive from my work	85%	95%
Support given by the College for community service	58%	65%
Support given by the College for faculty research	39%	56%
The supervision of my position	74%	88%
Variety of work	89%	98%
Workload	62%	93%
Your relationships with your colleagues	89%	90%

Table 19B: Respondents' Satisfaction with Aspects of Their Job at Their Primary Institution by Age Group

Job Aspect	Respondents' Reported Age Under 45	Respondents' Reported Age 45–55	Respondents' Reported Age Over 55
Benefits/Recognition/Salary/Tenure			
Benefits	69%	64%	77%
Medical/health insurance benefits available	60%	45%	70%
Recognition of your performance	77%	56%	71%
Salary / compensation	70%	44%	55%
Salary for my position	77%	48%	53%
Job security / tenure prospects	77%	71%	89%
Opportunities			
Autonomy and independence	93%	76%	86%
Opportunities for career advancement	83%	57%	66%
Opportunities to use your skills and abilities	87%	73%	82%
Opportunity for advancement	87%	64%	66%
Opportunity to try new, innovative ideas	93%	80%	87%
Opportunity to use my abilities in my position	90%	80%	92%
Opportunity to work independently	93%	82%	92%
General Work Environment			
An atmosphere of academic freedom	80%	80%	81%
Climate for racial and ethnic minority faculty members	73%	74%	84%
College support for the professional growth of the faculty	87%	66%	68%
Feeling safe in the work environment	83%	78%	92%
Flexibility to balance work and family life	83%	64%	76%
General environmental working conditions	77%	68%	80%
Interactions with students in the classroom setting	90%	91%	90%
Involvement of faculty in College decisions	77%	64%	65%
Meaningfulness of your work	97%	89%	93%
Mission of the College	97%	91%	90%
Quality of your relationship with your school's administration	97%	74%	82%
Relationships with peers	83%	95%	93%
Sense of accomplishment I receive from my work	97%	86%	87%
Support given by the College for community service	73%	52%	59%
Support given by the College for faculty research	70%	39%	32%
The supervision of my position	73%	80%	77%
Variety of work	90%	89%	93%
Workload	80%	62%	65%
Your relationships with your colleagues	83%	93%	93%

Summary: Overall, respondents were most satisfied with the mission of their college (94%) and least satisfied with the support given by the college for faculty research (54%). However, this varied—sometimes strongly—by age and employment status (full- or part-time). Part-time respondents were, on the average, more satisfied than full-time respondents. Respondents under 45 were the most satisfied. Respondents 45–55 were least satisfied, and respondents over 55 were in the middle in terms of general satisfaction. It is important to note that satisfaction with the climate for racial and ethnic minority faculty members differed considerably between minority (60%)

and non-minority faculty (92%), indicating that respondents' positionalities are a significant contextual consideration for their views.

Mobility and Retirement

Table 20 shows respondents' likelihood of leaving their job at their primary institution within different time frames. **In general, the wider the time frame (i.e., the further out respondents' were estimating), the more likely respondents thought it would be that they would leave their primary institution.** This relationship held true when correlated with age: regardless of respondents' age, the longer the time frame they were considering, the more likely they thought it would be that they would leave their primary institution. Interestingly, when correlated with age, respondents who were over 55 had the lowest rates for likelihood of leaving across all time frames (perhaps because this group had higher rates of being tenured or at least being on a tenure track) while respondents 45 to 55 had the highest rates for likelihood of leaving across all time frames (perhaps because this is a group seeking tenure track status).

Table 20: Respondents' Likelihood of Leaving Their Job at Their Primary Institution					
In the next year		In the next 5 years		In the next 10 years	
Not at all likely	48%	Not at all likely	21%	Not at all likely	12%
Not very likely	21%	Not very likely	17%	Not very likely	10%
Somewhat likely	13%	Somewhat likely	24%	Somewhat likely	19%
Very likely	15%	Very likely	32%	Very likely	41%
Don't know / NA	3%	Don't know / NA	6%	Don't know / NA	19%
# Question Respondents	154	# Question Respondents	160	# Question Respondents	135

Table 21 shows reasons respondents gave for potentially leaving their primary academic institution. **The most frequently given reason for leaving an institution was retirement (52%), followed by more compensation (30%), more career advancement opportunities (28%), and more opportunities to use skills/abilities (22%).** It should be noted that respondents' age had a strong effect on choices in this area. For respondents under 45, the top responses were: more advancement opportunities (53%), more compensation (50%), and more opportunities to use skills/abilities (33%). For respondents 45–55, the top responses were: more compensation (54%), more career advancement opportunities (44%), more flexibility to balance work/life issues (32%), and retirement (32%). For respondents over 55, the top responses were: retirement (78%), more flexibility to balance work/life issues (19%), and more opportunities to use skills/abilities (18%). Similar to the information in Tables 19A and 19B, these age differences may be indicative of a need for different incentives for different ages in order to retain current, and attract new, faculty.

Table 21: Respondents' Reasons for Which They Are Likely to Leave Their Primary Academic Institution

Reason	%
Retirement	52%
More compensation	30%
More career advancement opportunities	28%
More opportunities to use skills/abilities	22%
More flexibility to balance work/life issues	21%
More opportunities to improve my teaching	16%
Reduced workload	16%
More career development opportunities	15%
Better benefits	12%
A more meaningful job	11%
More autonomy and independence	11%
More job security/better tenure prospects	11%
More personal recognition	10%
Better relationships with colleagues	9%
More amenable institutional culture	9%
Ability to work and live near my spouse/partner/child	6%
Other (Please specify)	6%
Illness/disability	5%
More opportunities to improve my clinical skills	5%
More variety of work	4%
To go back to school full-time	3%

Summary: It is to be expected that the longer someone stays in a profession, the more likely they are to work at more than one institution. The data from this survey reflect that phenomenon. However, the reasons for switching institutions, or even leaving the profession altogether, vary strongly by age. More career advancement opportunities were very important to respondents under 45 (53%), somewhat important for respondents 45–55 (44%), and not very important for respondents over 55 (10%). Retirement had the opposite pattern: it was very important to respondents over 55 (78%), somewhat important to respondents 45–55 (32%), and not very important for respondents under 45 (10%). However, it is not new information that the nursing faculty population is aging and increasingly likely to leave their institution, for whatever reason. Furthermore, the object of understanding reasons for switching/leaving will not lead to an increase in the number of nursing faculty if the information is solely used to increase competition among institutions for those who are currently employed as faculty. What would be more important to understand is what draws individuals into being nursing faculty, especially if they do so after holding a non-faculty career for some time.

Conclusion

As mentioned in the Background section, the purpose of this survey was to gather data to identify roles and responsibilities of faculty at all levels for further analysis and development of subsequent recommendations. There is already a shortage of faculty among institutions both in Massachusetts and nationally. This survey gathered information that is relevant to both the retention of current faculty and the recruitment of new faculty.

To begin with, information that should be noted about the respondent population includes the following. It is not known whether these are reflective of the faculty population as a whole or represent biases in the survey results.

- 77% held full-time positions.
- 67% had been at their present primary institution 10 or fewer years.
- 63% held some form of professorship.
- 56% were not tenured or on a tenure track.
- 55% taught exclusively at the practical nursing or associate degree level.
- 54% reported teaching for 10 or fewer years.
- 52% reported that a likely reason for their leaving their current primary institution is retirement.

Second, this survey verified information already known about the nursing faculty workforce.

- It is aging: 32% of survey respondents were 60 or older.
- It is not diverse, either in terms of gender or race/ethnicity: 96% of respondents identified as female and 95% identified as White.
- The nursing faculty shortage has often led to an increase in workload: 51% of respondents reported that their workload had increased as a result of the faculty shortage.
- There is a wide variety of means for calculating workload: 29% of respondents did so via credits per semester, 22% courses per semester, 20% credits per academic year, and 17% other means.
- Faculty engage in a range of responsibilities and additional activities, although the relative amount of time spent in particular roles varied according to employment status (full- versus part-time) and teaching level (associate versus bachelor's versus master's).
- Respondents at the undergraduate level spent a larger proportion of their time in clinical teaching than respondents at the graduate level. Respondents at the graduate level spent a larger proportion of their time in research than respondents at the undergraduate level.
- The most frequent type of joint appointment was a combined faculty and advanced practice position.

However, several new issues or pieces of information were identified through the survey.

- The percentage of jobs that were joint appointments was lower than expected (13% of respondents) and it was unclear whether 35% of those were actual joint appointments or simply multiple, separate jobs.

- Respondents generally spent the same proportion of time in administrative responsibilities (15–18%), classroom teaching (40–43%), and student advisement (4–7%) regardless of their teaching level (e.g., practical, associate, bachelor's). The expected result was for these to vary by teaching level.
- Satisfaction with different job aspects varies considerably according to a respondent's positionality. Important factors affecting satisfaction with particular aspects include employment status (full- or part-time), race/ethnicity, and age.
- Younger faculty cohorts were not necessarily more diverse in terms of gender and race/ethnicity than older ones.
- Workload calculations of courses versus credits do not measure the same thing and are not comparable.

Overlaying different findings with each other reveals a less than positive picture of future workloads for nursing faculty. Fifty-one percent (51%) of survey respondents reported that their workload had increased as a result of the faculty shortage. Given that 32% of respondents were 60 or older, and will likely be retiring within the next 10 years (78% of respondents over 55 indicated that retirement was a reason for potentially leaving their institution), it is probable that this workload will continue to increase unless an infusion of new faculty can be made. There is some indication that nursing faculty entering the profession do so later in life: the average age of someone who reported teaching 10 years or less was 47. When the potential for even greater workloads is combined with the approximate age level of those entering the profession, as well as the fact that 32% of respondents between the ages of 45 and 55 indicated that one of the reasons they were likely to leave their institution had to do with flexibility to balance work/life issues, it is likely that filling faculty positions will only become more difficult.

Furthermore, there is some evidence that the nature of faculty positions may be out of alignment with current demand within the workforce: one in five full-time respondents achieved that status through multiple positions, potentially indicating that there is a demand for full-time positions that is not being met by institutions. When overlaid with job satisfaction information, a picture that emerges is one of part-time and/or non-tenure track positions with less satisfactory benefits (especially medical) that, while perhaps more budget-friendly for institutions, are less satisfactory for faculty. In addition, the current distribution of faculty may not be in alignment with policies focused on increasing the number of nurses who hold bachelor's degrees. Fifty-five percent (55%) of respondents to the survey reported teaching exclusively at the practical nursing or associate level and a number of those hold credentials that are not transferrable to teaching at the bachelor's level or higher.

The degree to which the nursing faculty population is not in alignment with the communities for which they are preparing nurses is a concern, especially given that minority respondents were much less satisfied with the climate for racial and ethnic minority faculty members than non-minority respondents (60% versus 92% respectively). This suggests that while many faculty think their institution is culturally aware and sensitive, it may not be so in actuality. As a consequence, programs may face unanticipated challenges in properly preparing nurses to work in diverse communities or to welcome diverse professionals to their ranks. Prior to the survey, the researchers expected that younger faculty cohorts would be more diverse than older ones. This did not hold true with regard to the study's data.

An area that would be important for future study would be a survey of how and why individuals transferred into nursing faculty later in life (e.g., after age 40). As mentioned above, the data from the NFW survey indicate that a number of nursing faculty entered the profession later. What was it that attracted this group to the profession? What drew them away from their other career? How can more individuals be recruited? How can individuals with diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds from within underrepresented communities be more effectively recruited? It is important that colleges of nursing look to outside sources in order to increase the number of faculty. Otherwise, everyone is simply competing over the same limited pool and not truly expanding the number of individuals in the profession.

